

REMARKS

Claims 11-29 and 37-44 are pending in this divisional application. In the Office Action dated March 5, 2003, the Examiner maintained his rejections of the claims over the art of record in the First Office Action dated September 27, 2002. In that action, claims 11-13, 17, 23, 24, 37-39 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,498 to Habusha *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,167 to Boyle *et al.* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,963 to Bosco. Claims 14, 15, 25, 40 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Habusha *et al.* in view of Boyle *et al.* further in view of Bosco further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,210 to Foladare *et al.* Claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Habusha *et al.* in view of Boyle *et al.* further in view of Bosco further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,592 to Alumbaugh. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Habusha *et al.* in view of Boyle *et al.* further in view of Bosco further in view of Alumbaugh further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,454 to Wang *et al.* Claims 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Habusha *et al.* in view of Boyle *et al.* further in view of Bosco further in view of Alumbaugh further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561 to Dillon. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Habusha *et al.* in view of Boyle *et al.* further in view of Bosco further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,632,011 to Landfield *et al.*

In the present RCE, Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the agreement reached with the Examiner in the telephonic interview of June 12, 2003. In the interview, the Examiner agreed that the amendments made herein with respect to Email communication, the source of indication of the recipients being in the indication sent, and substituting "if" for "when" with respect to whether the message is stored, clarified certain distinctions of the invention over the art of record. Because the amendment to the claims would necessitate another search, the present RCE application is filed according to the Examiner's suggestion to facilitate prosecution of the invention.

The present amendment is made solely to facilitate prosecution of certain embodiments of the invention and is not an acknowledgement that Applicant agrees with the

rejection of the original claims. Accordingly, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims or claims of different scope in one or more continuation applications.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



Mark W. Roberts, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 46,160

MWR:dms/pep

Enclosures:

Postcard  
Check  
Fee Transmittal Sheet (+ copy)  
Request for Continued Examination (+ copy)

1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400  
Seattle, WA 98101-4010  
(206) 903-8728 (telephone)  
(206) 903-8820 (fax)